

War and the Catholic Church

FREDERICK SIEDENBURG, S.J.

Reprinted from the "American Journal of Sociology," Nov., 1925

THE appalling magnitude and the refined savagery of the World War must have convinced every normal person that war is the greatest and most far-reaching evil in the world. To recall but in a general way its terrible toll of life and property, and its more deadly destruction of mental and moral values, must give to every human will an inspiration to do the utmost that such a catastrophe shall never again occur. When we contemplate the travesty of the peace pact and the possibility of an even deadlier war, we shudder at the outcome and fear that it may be the end of civilization. No wonder the cry comes from every corner, from victor and vanquished, "Outlaw war!" "Disband every army and scuttle every navy!" Hating war, we went to war to end war, and now we find, as with nearly every war that went before, it was a delusion and a snare.

There can be no difference of opinion in this, that war is a failure as an international solvent of difficulties, and that it should be eliminated from the world. But the real question is one of means, the processes by which wars shall cease, and here as elsewhere, ultimate success can come only by an impartial consideration of all the factors that go to make war, and in seeking a solution, reckoning first with unalterable principles and, not least, with fundamental human emotions. We may propose the plan of personal non-resistance, the refusal to perpetuate the race, the denial of budgets for armies and navies, a world-court, a league of nations, and even an international communism, and yet the solution is not in sight because there exist principles that defy such simple solutions, and there are facts that would almost make them a folly.

If a solution is to be found which will give us a warless world, it will be when we have educated a foolish world to realize the benefits of peace among all men, irrespective of race, creed, color, or nation. It will be found when our education will cease to exalt a false patriotism and the exploits of war, and when we put into their place a regard for international amity and a recognition of the triumphs of peace. In the education of youth we must parallel and even supplant such phrases as "Don't give up the ship!" "I'll fight it out on this line if it takes all summer!" "Remember the Maine," "Lafayette, we are here!" with those nobler expressions as Washington's "Let foreign engagements be fulfilled in perfect good faith," or the more familiar words of Lincoln, "With malice toward none, with charity to all," or the more graphic phrase of Sherman, "War is hell!" We must teach the patriotism of a Wendell Phillips as expressed by another patriot, John Boyle O'Reilly:

A sower of mighty seed was he,
A woodman who hewed toward the light,
Who dared to be a traitor to country
When country was traitor to right.

This change in national ideals will not be accomplished in a day, nor by the enthusiastic efforts of those lovers of mankind who would impetuously take war out of the vocabulary of the world and establish overnight an Elysium of peace. We must deal with history, with tradition, with education, with human nature and all its frailties, and most of all, with that subtle thing called "national honor."

What has the Catholic Church to offer on this question of peace and war? Its doctrine of war, which is an application of the principles of justice to a phase of interstate relations, has not changed in essence since it was first formulated. It is the same today as it was before the World War, because even more paramount than the colossal crime of that fruitless war are the eternal principles of ethics. It is the same as it was when Grotius wrote his *De Juri Belli et Pacis* in 1625, or when a few years before (1623) a French monk, Eméric Crucé in his book, *The New Cynæas*, proposed to the monarchs

of his day the first international peace congress to be held in the city of Venice. It is the same as when the Church under the egis of the Cross drove from Europe the Turk and his menacing crescent. It is the same as when Leo the Great repulsed Attila at the gates of Rome, after the Goth had sacked the treasures of Europe. It is the same as when the early Christians were martyred by Nero. It is the same as when Paul, preaching peace, ordained submission to authority as submission to God Himself. It is the same as when the Great Master who though He declared that all who take the sword shall perish with the sword, also declared "On the chair of Moses have sitten the Scribes and Pharisees, all things which they command you, keep and do," though he added, "but according to their works do ye not."

The attitude of the Catholic Church is unchanged because its position is fixed in the absolute demands of justice, but this does not imply that the change in ideals and forms of government, the advance in national civilization, the growth of humanitarian feeling, and the lessons of experience have not modified the expression and the application of that attitude. Many motives for warfare which were formerly tolerated are now seen to be unsound and many old customs in prosecuting war are now rejected (in theory at least) as uncivilized. Human rights are more clearly expressed and more clearly recognized by belligerents—at least we hope they are.

War is essentially a conflict between two or more groups of human wills carried on in the physical plane. There is no other way of compelling assent than by physical force, when appeals to reason, to conscience, to self-interest, to affection, fail. The responses to these appeals, of their very nature, depend on the free consent of persons, a consent that ultimately cannot be forced precisely because it is free. This is true of nations as well as of individuals, because, in the last analysis, individuals speak for the nation. When two sovereign States disagree on some matter of vital import and cannot settle their differences by process of reasoning, by compromise, or by arbitration, they generally appeal to force, or to a threat of it. Equivalently one says to the other, "You are unjustly depriving me of something

which is vital, therefore you compel me to inflict upon your country such injury that you may find submission to my demands preferable to rejection of them." And the other replies, "You have no rights in this matter. I shall resist your claims and do damage to you until you find it more advantageous to withdraw your claims than to prosecute them." This is the essence of war, the assertion of moral right by armed might.

The dominant doctrine that must ultimately prevail if we are to have a peaceful world is that States, like individuals, are bound by the natural law, and therefore they are bound to love their neighbors as themselves. This does not mean that a nation must regard another nation with the same *degree* of solicitude as its own, but it must regard it so that good is always wished for it, and evil is never done to it. When we look close into this problem we will find that nations are nothing else than a collection of men, and, therefore, like the individual man, they are collectively bound to follow the dictates of man's rational nature, so that their actions may be preeminently human actions and ethically moral. In other words, nations, like individuals, are obliged to love one another.

The reason why individual beings are bound to love one another is because, to attain the fulfillment of their natural desire of happiness, they must live in social amity with their fellows, and, for that reason, they have the same human nature, with the same physical and psychic attractions, and thus are they made one. Reason reveals this community resemblance between them, and instinct points the same way. Now in like manner, States or organized groups of individuals resemble one another and are, in fact, moral persons. Hence they, too, have something in common, something which unites them, and only by loving each other are they mutually developed as is the case with individuals.

Another natural basis for loving other nations than our own may be found in the intellectual appreciation of their organization and high mission. This dictate of reason was understood even by the pagan stoics of old, as the brotherhood of man, a truth which Judaism and Christianity have reenforced on higher and nobler grounds.

However, there are some important differences in the application of the natural law to individuals and to States. Individuals may of their own accord make sacrifices for others, but the government of a State, since its primary duty is to look after those whom it represents, is not free to arbitrarily benefit another State at the expense of its own. It holds the property rights of its citizens, in their behalf, and may not gratuitously dispose of them. Another difference in the natural law as applied to individuals and to States is that the State has no future life and its activities are limited to this world, because its aims are primarily material and temporal. The State, being incapable of evangelical perfection, is not amenable to such Christian counsels as "Sell all what thou hast," or "Turn the other cheek."

For those who believe in the teachings of the Old and the New Testament, it may be remarked that nowhere in the code of these Books is war explicitly declared immoral; in fact by implication it is pronounced moral, inasmuch as again and again wars are permitted without protest, and soldiers are praised without qualification. In this, the Scriptures follow the natural law, which, after all is nothing else than a participation of the Divine Law in the scheme of human things, the economy of God with men. Law and order, rights and duties, are ordained of God and approved by reason, and if law and order, rights and duties, mean anything, they mean that their sanctions must be upheld, they must be defended to the end, even to the end of physical conflict. The individual citizen must be punished for a crime clearly committed, and so must the collective state when it is the unjust aggressor. Abolish these sanctions, and the way to anarchy and chaos is not far distant. Hence, wars will always be possible, but they need not be actual.

In the matter of warfare, the Catholic Church has always followed the maxim—*Virtus stat in medio*, "Virtue abides in moderation." She does not praise or condemn war absolutely, but indicates in what circumstances and to what extent it may be practiced, rejecting alike the two extremes of militarism and pacifism. Militarism is the expression in international politics of that materialistic philosophy which is often designated as "Darwinism," and whose doctrines are summarized in the well-

known phrases "the struggle for existence," and "the survival of the fittest." Hence the logical militarist holds that there is a necessary struggle for existence among the nations of mankind, which, as their populations increase (as for example Japan), will become more bitter and more desperate. Only those nations will survive which make themselves more powerful than their neighbors.

The exponents of this atheistic philosophy flourish wherever practical Christianity decays, and strange to relate, it is even held by many professing Christians who have not grasped the primary implications of their creed. Recently this was the national policy of the German empire, whose authorized exponents, like Treitschke and Bernardi proclaimed (*Germany and the Next War*): "War is a biological necessity of the first importance, a regulative element in the life of mankind which cannot be dispensed with." "Might is at once the supreme right, and the dispute as to what is right is decided by the arbitrament of war." "War gives a biologically just decision since its decision rests upon the very nature of things," and so forth. It might be said in passing that the memoirs of the British Admiral Lord Fisher and the British Commander-in-Chief Lord Roberts show that they, too, held the same views.

This diabolic philosophy, the very antithesis of Christianity, and at variance with fundamental humanity, is to be found in nearly every nation. Germany has her Kruppists, England has her Jingoes, France has her Chauvinists, Russia her Pan-Slavists, and we, not to be outdone, our Decaturs. The *Chicago Tribune* has as the heading of its editorial column every morning, "Our country! In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong." The reasons assigned for necessary war by these so-called patriots are impressively enumerated as overpopulation, the omnipotence of the State, human progress, and the fuller development of man. All of these can readily be shown to be false in theory and in practice. In passing we may remark that Belgium, not naturally fertile, supports with ease nearly seven hundred persons to the square mile, and by the same ratio the United States could support nearly two billions of

people, and we have not yet exhausted irrigation and intensive farming.

As to the argument of the omnipotence of the State; right order as well as right reason tells us that the State exists solely for man, and not man for the State. War never has, and never will, promote social progress or develop human character. To say so is to belie history as well as reason. Wars have not only destroyed the achievements of men, but only too often the men who could have achieved. They have given us new inventions, but they have been for the most part instruments of destruction. They have developed physical bravery which must always be second to moral courage in any progress of man or nation. It is a truism that it is more difficult to live for one's country than to die for one's country, and that the demands of permanent good citizenship give greater scope for exalted heroism than the momentary demands of valor in battle. Theodore Roosevelt surely nodded when he wrote, "There are certain manly and adventurous qualities which war alone can develop." The truth is better stated by Proverbs long ago, "Better is he that mastereth his spirit, than the stormer of cities."

The atmosphere of Mars is essentially one of hatred, pride, and cruelty, and in it thrive the worst qualities of greed and lust and hypocrisy. Good can never come from evil, and hence only to prevent a greater evil, the destruction of an eternal principle of justice, can a lesser evil like war ever be tolerated. Dr. C. W. Saleeby in the *Contemporary Review*, April, 1914, trying to find one redeeming note in war, said, "If nations sent their trash, instead of their treasure, to fight their battles then indeed war might be defended as a dreadful purgative of nations." Even this merit must be denied to war, for its victims are always the young, the valiant, and the fit—the flower of the flock.

The opposite extreme of this militarism is pacifism that denies to war any lawful function in human affairs. Militarism masquerades as pure patriotism, whereas it is but nationalism grown rank, while false pacifism more subtly clothes itself in supernatural virtue and claims to be the quintessence of Christianity. In modern times it is connected with the Quakers, the followers of Tolstoy,

and the so-called "non-resistant pacifists." The doctrine of uniform unlawfulness of war under any and all circumstances finds no support in reason, for there is no right so fundamental as that of self-defense. It finds no support in tradition, for it is based on a misunderstanding of history and a misinterpretation of the Christian Scriptures and morals. Tolstoy did not believe in Christ's Divinity, and there is no good reason why the exegesis, or scriptural interpretations of George Fox and his followers, should be preferred to the studies and learning of twenty centuries of the Christian Church. The Sermon on the Mount contains, indeed, the crystallization of Christ's ethical teaching, and teaches explicitly the love of enemies, pardon for offenses, and submission to injuries. It is equally true that benedictions are to fall on those who embrace this course of conduct. However, it must be noted that these are personal injunctions and have for their goal the rewards of a future life.

As before stated, government has no future life to look to, and must secure its own well-being here and now. It cannot lay aside its trust for others, and, as a martyr nation, yield to violence without any attempt to self-defense. We may cordially render our tribute of admiration to sincere pacifists for their staunch adherence to convictions which are unpopular, and for their generous spirit of world-charity, but their doctrines would produce anarchy, in this worldly world, if pursued to their logical consequences. If a commonwealth may not resist an unjust foreign aggressor, it may not resist a domestic assailant, and if it is unlawful to defend others, it is unlawful to defend one's self. So criminals, collective or individual, would have a free hand, impunity would give rise to more lawlessness, and anarchy would soon destroy civilization.

The Catholic Church rejects alike extreme militarism and extreme pacifism, and it is fortified by the test of reason and experience, of time and tradition. Pending the establishment of a perfect Utopia on earth, that is, the universal acceptance of God's justice as the rule for all international, as well as national, dealings, there will occur from time to time instances of unjust invasions of genuine rights. Pending the institution of a universally

accepted tribunal whose awards shall be backed by the combined moral forces of the civilized world, there is no peaceful way to settle such international disputes as may occur in which each of the contending parties may be so convinced of the justice of its claims that it refuses to give way. In the one case, and in the other, unless we change our education, sublimate our patriotism, and realize our religion, war will tend always to recur. Unfortunately war, or at least the specter of war, is still the grim policeman of an unrepenting world.

God does not want war. On the contrary He has set up on earth a means of perpetuating among the changing generations the principles and the ideals of Christianity, the observance of which would render war impossible and even unthinkable. But He permits this terrible scourge, as He permits other consequences of sin, to bring home to His erring children the folly of abandoning His laws. Men have the power denied to brutes of living by reason and law; if they choose to live by passion and instinct, they cannot wonder that they fall into brute conditions. International relations must be lifted into the region of reason and justice, yes, into the regions of religion, if war is to cease.

What has the Catholic Church done to prevent war and what is she doing today? First and foremost is the fact that for nearly twenty centuries she has taught the individual the doctrines of the Prince of Peace, and urged men and women to follow in the self-denial of His footsteps. This teaching is the very antithesis of war. As a psychic power it tempers the mind and heart of man and tends to transform him into some likeness of the Master Himself, and, in doing so, it operates to prevent wars and all their hideous horrors. Following her counsels of perfection, strong men and frail women, through centuries often crude and cruel, have consecrated in the peace of God their lives to their human fellows.

When the Church was potent with princes as well as with people, she used her influence in many ways. She made the sanctuary a refuge at all times, and for all people, and extended this right of protection even to wayside shrines. Then in the tenth century, by the authority of several French councils, she instituted the well-known

Peace of God, which gave protection to all non-combatants in time of war. This custom soon spread to the whole Church, which officially forbade under pain of excommunication all acts of private warfare or violence against ecclesiastical persons and buildings, and against women, children, peasants, merchants, and even against cattle and agricultural instruments.

A similar institution was the *Truce of God*, which forbade fighting on all the greater feast days and during the seasons of Advent and Lent, and finally from Wednesday evening to Monday morning. By these provisions, scarcely more than a quarter of a year was left for hostilities. Would that we had had such a deterrent during the World War! Its pauses might have made us think—and repent.

These two Church institutions were incorporated into the laws of many nations, and to them were added laws which forbade the carrying of offensive weapons and which demanded the arbitration of private feuds. Moreover, during the Middle Ages the Franciscans and Dominicans were the greatest factors in putting an end to feudalism; in fact, they were the true pacifists of their day.

When the popes were temporal as well as spiritual rulers, they were often the arbitrators of national disputes and impartial history may not deny them the honored name of peace-maker. To mention but a few: Innocent III prevented a score of wars; so did Boniface VIII and Martin V. Alexander VI prevented a war between Spain and Portugal in a controversy over the newly discovered lands of the fifteenth century.

Even the Crusades, while they made war on the Moslem, united the nations at a time of international crisis and prevented several European wars. At times the popes failed in their efforts at peace just as the peace proposals of Benedict XV failed, and as the "Fourteen Points" of Wilson failed. But such efforts always have an influence and are never in vain—one step nearer to the goal of world-peace.

In our own day, we have witnessed Leo XIII expounding Christian principles of international charity, and arbitrating between Germany and Spain the dispute over the Caroline Islands; we have witnessed Pius X warning Germany and rebuking Austria, and pleading for peace;

yes, dying of a broken heart because his voice was not heard; we have witnessed Benedict XV reminding the belligerents of international law and, in August, 1917, exhorting the nations to end the war and to provide for a stable peace. He pleaded for a general disarmament, for international arbitration, for freedom of commerce, for the restoration of invaded territory, and, if necessary, for the condonation of damages. Germany evasively declined, and the Allies, through President Wilson, sympathetically refused. What sorrows would have been spared the world if these peace proposals which antedated the "Fourteen Points" of Wilson, had been accepted! The present Pontiff, Pius XI, has made peace and charity his shibboleth, and in that spirit has condemned the invasion of the Ruhr and the Italian attack on Greece. He has done his utmost to bind up the wounds of war.

The Church, through its rulers, has at times sanctioned war, and even blessed it when it seemed the only way to punish the violation of national rights. If the popes have sponsored a war that was unjustified because they were ignorant of the truth or sinned against the light, they must take the blame. At the worst, such cases were rare exceptions, for the Church regularly ranged herself and her forces for peace and justice and against war. Her Christ-given doctrine of international good will and brotherhood has been in the past her greatest agency, and it remains the only power that ultimately will in a competitive world substitute conference for conflict.

The Church and Unrest

C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J.

Sermon preached by the Rev. C. C. Martindale, S.J., on Sunday, September 12, in the Church of Notre Dame at Geneva, in presence of official representatives of the Catholic Powers and of Catholic statesmen attending the Assembly of the League. Father Martindale is the first English priest to have been invited to preach at the League's Assembly in Geneva.—Reprinted from the "Catholic Times."

The earth is melted, and all that dwell therein: I have established the pillars thereof.—Psalm lxxiv. 3.

THOSE who would fain see human life harmonious are saddened by the extreme difficulty of so much as drawing even the smallest groups of men together, and by the precarious nature of the unities that from time to time are formed. The world presents the appearance of a shifting sand, in which the winds from one moment to another create eddies, systems, even, if you will, of eddies that transfer themselves with incredible rapidity hence thither, or flatten out and vanish almost before the attention can fix itself upon them. Men become tempted to think that the continual displacements, dissipations, impermanent formations of the physical universe cannot be bettered in the mental and moral worlds, and yet they long to have it so. And they reflect that after all there is order in that physical universe, and they would fain see that lovely dream, a free, intelligent order realized among men. Nor are they wrong in their hope: perhaps they are mistaken in their method.

WHY THE WORLD IS CHAOTIC

The Holy Father has recently said that the modern world is chaotic because men are individualists. Hence not only inability to cooperate, but refusal of that self-sacrifice that alone makes cooperation possible, and, still more, refusal of authority. Few would fear to acknowl-

edge that the Pope is right. Whatever ideals lurk in the words "Socialism," "Communism," one may be forgiven for seeing, in most leaders even of such movements, the extreme of selfishness. The less a man has been accustomed to position and power, and their perquisites, the less can he control himself when he possesses them.

It may be safer for me to say that what I can see more easily, of course, namely, individuals, seems to me to verify entirely the Pope's assertion. I really do seem to see, far too often, a general liquefaction of character. Men suddenly, as they say, "throw in their hand." They seem to take up a job rather perforce than by conviction or real choice; they are restless in it; they tend abruptly to desert it. I get letter after letter with phrases like these: "My friends are working desperately hard, and halt, once a fortnight, to wonder what it's all for, and are apt to decide, like me, that it isn't for anything." "I cannot see any point or purpose in life." "I apparently work to live, and live to work. I can't keep it up. The circle is too vicious." It is. Hence, neurasthenia; and, in less-balanced groups, which I need not specify, a too high percentage of insanity and suicide. It is but logical.

LACK OF PRINCIPLES

I cannot think that this personal disintegration, which clearly must issue into a social one, is merely the result of the war. I know that men, who have been subjected to a strain, and deserve a holiday, are apt to find it difficult to resume work, even when they know they have had enough rest. Unless, of course, the microbe of work has so dug itself into them that they are fretful when *not* working. But this particular malady is not general. I think the insane upheaval of the war shattered the framework of convention which already was getting dislocated, and both men and women found that they had been living precisely, within *conventions*, and not from living principles.

The special phenomenon of our time seems to be not only the desperate waking up to the fact that there are no adequate principles of life—"I suppose people believe in something nowadays," says a character in Mr. Galsworthy's *Saga*, "but I don't know what it is"; and another

character sees "veneration killed, self-denial 'off,' atavism buried, sentiment derided, the future in the air," and modernity a "dance of gnats"—but, a kind of attack seems to me in process of being made on principle as such. With the nineteenth century suggestion that you could not tell whether what you thought was true, but only that you thought it, came a real weakening both in the will to think, and, I hold, the power of thinking. Hurry joined with this, and has made both continuity of thought and concentration harder and harder, as teachers in schools tell us. Historically, the world was shown more and more as an inevitable and inexplicable evolution, a biological hypothesis having been transported into the realms of ideas and even religion; psychologically, we have been analyzed back to a bundle of instincts which we are bidden not repress, especially if the instinct be sexual; and it is certain that boys are substituting everywhere machinery for reading.

MR. BERTRAND RUSSELL'S VIEW

And the option seems to be either the view of Mr. Bertrand Russell, or what we shall say in a moment. That mathematician, philosophizing, says that man is the product of causes that had no prevision of the end they were achieving; that his origin, his growth, his hopes and fears, his loves and beliefs, are but the outcome of accident; that no fire, no heroism, no intensity of thought and feeling can preserve an individual beyond the grave; that all the labors of the ages, all the devotion, all the inspiration, all the noon-day brightness of the human genius, are destined to extinction in the vast death of the solar system, and that the whole temple of man's achievement must inevitably be buried beneath the débris of a universe in ruins—that all this is so nearly certain that "only within the scaffolding of these truths, only on the firm foundations of unyielding despair, can the soul's habitation be safely built."

In our boyhood we read an allegory about "The House without a Background." You looked through the windows of the ballroom and saw, not darkness, but nothing. This was ghastly. It haunted us. But Mr. Russell's world is worse—the very dancers are but ghosts. Hence

the faithlessness, and hopelessness, and individualistic lack of true charity of our age: hence not only its restlessness, but its despondency, since Self always cheats Self, and to run without a goal exhausts; activity without aim breeds fretfulness; and pleasure is not happiness. The human creature develops only, but always, when the body is controlled by mind, and mind is illuminated by true ideas, ideas so splendid as to become ideals, and, presented thus to the will, as to become motives. And even these, in proportion as they are not universal and permanent, play us false.

WHAT BUILDS CHARACTER

In this welter of impressionism, the firm truths that concern God are, I hold with conviction, alone strong enough to establish the columns of character. I trust that I am clear. In a quite young man you may see many an act that is good, and many that are bad. These are not yet virtue, nor vice. In middle-age you may observe a certain repetition of behavior and of mood, that may be but custom, and not true stability: the war evoked deeds, assuredly, of heroism, but I know too well how these showed, often enough, that there was present in such lads quite glorious stuff that might become a personality, a character, but often it did not. No strong directive idea survived the vehement but limited stimulus of war, and when the pressures, especially if they had endured too long, were removed, the man collapsed.

Would that at least the great governing thought of God were well fixed and then active in men's minds. No absentee "The Deity"; but that sole self-sufficient One, infinite, eternal, immutable, omnipresent, all-wise, all-powerful, and all-good, and hence, personal as no human man is personal. Would that I had time to express how consolidating yet expansive, enriching yet simplifying, pacifying yet stimulating, is this tremendous truth, known for certain, to the whole man. Two consequences only will I indicate. A sense of absolute *obligation* is generated thereby; and the overwhelming duty of *veracity*. Yet to these I must add a third—the certainty of personal *vocation*.

For to Him on whom we wholly depend, we are wholly bound: the man who knows the very origin of truth dare

not commit soul-suicide by untruthfulness: God, who cannot, like a fool, act haphazard, cannot have created even the humblest among men without a purpose, and cannot but will the achievement of that purpose, and call each man thereto, nor can God's purposes be trivial. Need I say more to show that a man who is conscious that his whole being is constructed so as to involve paramount *duties* of *veracity* and *work* must be, in this age of mutual and general distrust, and of flight from effort, himself constructive of society, when his knowledge of essential and continuous obligation emancipates him from the spasmodic, the opportunistic contradictions of the selfish, from mood, and above all, from despondency? For hopelessness, due not so much to aims too high, as to aimlessness, is the curse of our young generation. It is the old tale of the one man who, with God, is ever the majority. Incredible strength and courage comes from these truths.

Speaking as a Catholic, I cannot, of course, but be sure that a contemplation of revealed truths, the supernatural mysteries of our faith, will do more both for the individual and for society than the profound, yet natural, knowledge that unaided intelligence can give us. I hold, with absolute conviction, that any Catholic is wise to "seek first," in every sense, "the Kingdom of God," and ensure thereby that the rest will be "added" to him. Let him see the vast dogmas of the most Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, and of grace, with its allied dogma of the Body of Christ, that is, ourselves incorporate with Jesus and indwelt by the Holy Spirit.

THE MODEL OF TRUE UNION

In the Trinity a Catholic perceives the model for all true union. For in the Trinity there are Three, and there is yet unity. But there is no fusion of those Three, nor is there any coerced subordination—indeed, no subordination of any kind, but, my point is, that where a union is sought by us on earth, we shall bitterly regret any method that forcibly subordinates any one element to another, and we shall surmise that a fusion of elements will lead but rarely to any vital union of elements. So, too, in Christ, there is indeed the most exquisite free subordination of the human to the divine, but no violence is done, and no

fusion, mixture, is involved. And we ourselves, who indeed are organically united with God through Christ, there is again no question of enslavement, however fully we be united with our head, nor yet of fusion merely, however truly one be the sap that springs through root and stock to the extremest tendrils of God's mystic vine, till the clusters shall redden with that sweetness that makes glad the heart of God. Holy Communion is indeed the triumph of Christ's power and love, that creates nor merely typifies that ever-increasing people of His, Body of His, exclusive of none, but increasing till Christ shall have "attained the full stature of His maturity."

THE PEACE OF CHRIST

And in these eternal facts, once more, we have the model and source of peace. Peace means freedom for orderly action. Freedom, for a machine or inanimate nature, however orderly be their action, cannot, save by metaphor, be called peaceful. Orderly action, for mere removal of control, gives but scope to anarchy. Action, since inertia is not peace. But in the Trinity is the very origin of order, the absolute freedom, and the terrible maximum of energy.

In Christ there is again a perfect freedom—"Power have I to lay down My life, and power to take it up once more." Action assuredly—"My Father worketh even until now; and I also work"—and an unbroken ordering of will—unbroken, yes, but unbroken still in agony, so that His peace permitted both Gethsemane and Calvary. No wonder, then, that when He says: Peace I leave with you—He has forthwith to specify—*My* peace I give to you; and, indeed, He adds, *Not* as the world gives give I.

And hence, a final dogma. By the Cross we have been saved. Wanton to disregard it: idle to attempt to uproot it. He then who would achieve anything salvific for the world has to recall the law of sacrifice. Humanity is not self-sufficient: nature alone is not perfectible. In the gradual healing of the world, we *must* be prepared not only to ask gifts from God, but to abandon some of what we would wish to receive from this world's masters. Christ, being rich, for our sake became poor: was among us, not

as one with servants, but as one who served: being in origin and by nature God, thought not the being treated as God a thing at all costs to be held on to, but emptied Himself, taking up the nature of a slave, and became, to man's eyes, just what man is, and no more; and, yet further, made Himself obedient even to death, and that, a death upon a cross. A Catholic, then, and to Catholics I speak, will seek to see, in any enterprise, even the highest, even in what concerns nations and the world, how far he can reproduce, and on the several levels of reality, the supreme and absolute truth and right, and what is revealed in our infallibly taught dogmas of the Trinity, the Incarnation, Grace, and the Atonement. And perhaps he will be ready to agree that every problem is, in the last resort, a moral one. I mean, not only because it requires energy of will and a real humility thus to seek our ultimate direction from God, but, because there is no scheme, no program, no equilibrium of weights, no sheaf of forces how perfectly soever arranged, that cannot be defeated by men who have not in them the desire to be just, merciful, and even self-sacrificing. We need a *change of heart*: we must pray for a new Pentecost.

[Father Martindale then continued his sermon in French. The following is a rough translation of the concluding passage.]

My Lord, You must have thought me very ingenuous to have come to talk dogma in this assembly, where the problems of the world are under discussion. To invite—for all I know—financiers to meditate upon the Trinity, politicians upon the Incarnation, diplomats upon the Cross. But, my Lord, who could contemplate the vast tragedy of our time: the international hatreds, the jealousies and the ambitions of those who have learnt nothing, the suspicion which reigns on all sides, that sort of panic fear which, it seems to me, broods over all governments, at any rate in Europe—even the domestic tragedies like our own coal troubles, which come so near to me personally since I so often meet and am so deeply attached to our good-hearted and honest mining people—who could look upon all this and not feel his heart bleed among so many hearts that bleed, and not long to keep alive at any price the spirit of hope in a world from which it has almost vanished?

Yet surely, my Lord, the real simpleton would be he

who thought it possible to remedy so vast a sore merely by some political program, some diplomatic convention, some economic system, or by some abstract theory, be it even the invention of the most sublime philosopher. *Oportet primum querere Dei regnum.* Then the rest will all follow.

THE CITY OF GOD

There is only one model, only one spring, only one spirit of life. *Fluminis impetus lætitificat civitatem Dei.* What, then, is that city if it be not the world when the reign of the Christ King shall have been established in it? What the river that brings it joy, if it be not the very spirit of God springing from the Divine throne and descending in sparkling streams upon the slopes of the apocalyptic mountain, through the forest where grow the celestial trees whose foliage is to heal the peoples?

In that invisible light let us see the light which the will-o'-the-wisps of this world will never kindle for us. May that *Dulcis Hospes Animæ* make our hearts like to the Heart of Jesus Itself, and may our prayer—so essential yet so insignificant—rise on the great wings that are given to us by the three saints of this year: Francis of Assisi, he who was crucified by love; Aloysius Gonzaga and Stanislaus Kostka, those two personifications of the Divine vocation; and may it be offered to God merged in the measureless prayer of Mary. Amen.

Religion and Capitalism

GEORGE O'BRIEN, LITT.D.

Reprinted from "Studies"

THE central doctrine of English Puritanism was that good works are a proof of election. Man is predestined to salvation or rejection; how can the individual learn to which destiny he is foredoomed? The Puritan answer was clear and unequivocal; frugality, thrift, industry and prosperity are the sure marks of God's choice. Worldly success became the certain pledge of an eternity of happiness, and thus, as Mr. Tawney says, "a halo of ethical satisfaction was added to the appeal of economic expediency." Business enterprise was at once the seal of election and the discharge of one's religious duty; to pursue actively and successfully the affairs of one's calling was the supreme object in life. The old barrier between nature and grace had been removed; no longer did men with vocations retire into monasteries or colleges; every man had now a vocation to glorify God by succeeding in business. The interests of business and religion became identical.

From this attitude it was but a small step to *laissez-faire*. Adam Smith, who saw in the harmony between self-interest and the public good the operation of a providential plan, was merely stating in terms of economics what the Puritans had stated in terms of ethics. Obviously these ideas left no room for the control of man's business relations by priest or parson; all interference with individual enterprise was a thwarting of God's providence. By the beginning of the nineteenth century the territory within which religion had ruled had contracted; economics had become, as politics had become a couple of centuries earlier, one of the lost provinces of the churches. The system of spiritually-enforced ethical control of man's economic life had given place to the system of unlimited competition. Catholicism had been replaced by Capitalism.